

Appl. No. 10/088,960
Amdt. dated April 26, 2005
Reply to Office Action of February 22, 2005

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 28 and 29 are rejected for alleged obviousness type double patenting. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for alleged indefiniteness. In order to expedite prosecution, claims 28 and 29 are now cancelled without prejudice to subsequent revival. It is the Applicants' understanding that the remaining claims, claims 24-27, are allowable as indicated by the Examiner at page 4 of the Office Action.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,


Beth L. Kelly
Reg. No. 51,868

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
BLK:blk
60476816 v1